

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Yamada (U.S. Patent 6,290,328). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In particular, Yamada does not disclose "examining a relationship of a position...when a unit of vertical transfer of the printing head is not a reciprocal of an integral vertical resolution of the print data." [In fact, Yamada does not disclose any vertical transfer of the printing head at all.] Instead, Yamada discloses only that the recording medium is advanced (see col. 11, lines 16-17 and lines 29-30). The advancement of the recording medium is the only relative motion disclosed between the recording medium and the print head in Yamada. This is in contrast to the present invention which relies on a vertical transfer means to displace the vertical printing head relative to the recording medium.

Furthermore, the feature recited in claim 1 of "a pitch of the pens of the printing head is not any one of an integral multiple of the vertical resolution and the reciprocal of the integral vertical resolution" is not disclosed in Yamada. In contrast, Yamada requires the number of passes be equal to the required output resolution divided by the nozzle resolution (see col. 12, lines 25-28). This ratio is defined to be an integer, which determines the number of passes in Yamada.

Therefore, Yamada does not disclose the feature "a unit of vertical transfer of the printing head is not a reciprocal of an integral vertical resolution of the print data, and a pitch of the pins of the printing head is not any one of an integral multiple of the vertical resolution and the reciprocal of the integral vertical resolution" as recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claim 6. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 6 are patentable over Yamada.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and claims 7-10 depend from claim 6. Therefore, claims 2-5 and claims 7-10 are patentable over Yamada at least for the reasons set forth

above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Consequently, all claims are in condition for allowance. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-10 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Jaquelin K. Spong  
Registration No. 52,241

JAO:JKS/jks

Date: August 20, 2003

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

AUG 20 2003

RECEIVED